

Edited and published from Liverpool by John Pinsent, MA DPhil., Dept of Greek, The University, PO Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, who is the sole proprietor and to whom, addressed by name, subscriptions, and contributions on any subject of classical interest, should be sent, and to whom, also by name only, cheques and checks made payable.

RATES p.a. of 10 issues (not August and September) SURFACE £4 UK & Europe, \$(US)10 elsewhere
AIR £5.50 Europe, \$(US)20 N.America, \$(US)25 Australasia

CONTENTS, the copyright of which is secured for the author at the end of each article

W.S.WATT(Aberdeen): <i>Notes on Quintilian, Books 10-12</i>	126-127
E.L.HARRISON(Leeds): <i>Virgil's use of the substitution motif</i>	127-128
L.WATSON(Sydney): <i>Apuleius, Apologia 16</i>	128-129
M.J.ALDEN(The Queen's University, Belfast): <i>Pythian X and Pindar's ineptitude</i>	129-134
J.GEIGER(Hebrew University of Jerusalem): <i>Cornelius Nepos and the authorship of the book on foreign generals</i>	134-136
JOHN MOLES(Bangor): <i>Plutarch, Crassus 13,4-6, and Cicero's de consiliis suis</i>	136-137
Review: JOHN MOLES(Bangor)	138-139
M.L.Clarke, <i>The Noblest Roman: Marcus Brutus and his Reputation</i> , London. Thames and Hudson, 1981. Pp. 157, £10.00	138-139
WALDEMAR HECKEL(The Calgary Institute for the Humanities): <i>Philip II and the quadriga</i>	139-140
MARILYN B.SKINNER(Northern Illinois): <i>Supplementary note on the Latin sexual language: Catullus 56.5-6</i>	140
F.JONES(St Andrews & Cape Town): <i>A visual pun at Juvenal 12.81</i>	140

The editorial notes in the last number of *LCM* were described by one subscriber (severely but justly) as 'chaotic' (the Editor would have preferred 'rambling'). The explanation was perhaps re-entry shock of the kind that affects many of us at the end of the Long Vacation and the beginning of a new academic year. That was also a contributory cause of the lateness of the number, not his own but that of the printer, always busy at that time, and it never in fact seems possible to get most of October's number printed up in July, however sensible that would be and however many the annual good resolutions. But it was not a cause of the apparent reversion to a scale of reduction already tried once and rejected - apparent reversion because it was not a deliberate decision taken in order to annoy readers by either the Editor or the Printer, but due to an error that crept in somehow during the process of reduction. For all these blemishes the Editor makes his customary monthly apology, and hopes that all three will be absent this month.

It was an interesting chance that brought to the top of the pile an article by the quondam Regius Professor of Humanity at Aberdeen, indeed the last holder of that noble title, and had it in print before only yesterday, Thursday 21st October 1982, the *Guardian* (? *The Guardian*) contained the news, under the heading 'Resignation over cuts', that the holder of the Regius Chair of Classics created there 2½ years ago had announced the night before 'his resignation in protest over spending cuts in his department' which 'would leave it "no longer fit" to be called a university department' - it having been reduced from 7 to 4 staff, and a request for two part-time staff, at a cost of about £13,000 a year, refused. Those who prefer to get their news from the *Times* (? *The Times*) had it confirmed today in a brief para under the heading 'Don to leave after cuts'. Professor John Rist is emigrating to North America (presumably, that is, returning to his job at the University of Toronto). None of this will be news to subscribers in this country, who can presumably read their papers as well as the Editor can, but he reprints it in order that those in other places may appreciate the severity of the cuts, to which, perhaps, Classics Departments, as neither generally large nor obviously contributing to the prosperity of the country, are particularly vulnerable. The same issue of the *Guardian*, this time under the heading 'Varsity cash cuts feared' (it is nice to see that old-fashioned name still used), carried a Government statement in the House of Lords that though 'we do intend that 1983-84 should complete the planned period of contraction and hope the level of grant provision then reached can be maintained in 1984-85 ... one cannot tie oneself to figures at a time of uncertain inflation rates' (which are in fact claimed to be falling). Professor Rist is fortunate to have somewhere to go and others, who can, will doubtless follow his example. The rest of us will have to make do with more or less voluntary retirement or keep our heads down and soldier on. The Editor, who started here at Liverpool in 1950 as half of a 2-man Department of Greek, temperamentally favours the latter, doubtful of the effectiveness of gestures, but, as he has had occasion before to use these notes to scotch rumours and false impressions about *LCM*, and as three persons in as many months have told him that they hear he has applied for early retirement (which is not, of course, the same as getting it: it can be refused in the 'managerial interest') takes this opportunity of stating publicly that he has not, and proposes to continue to cultivate his Voltairean garden and edit *LCM* as long as he is permitted and able to do so.

And to attend, on the 20th, 21st and 22nd April 1983, the colloquium on 'Caesar Augustus' to celebrate the eightieth birthday of Sir Ronald Syme, O.M., and hear the lectures of Professors Bowersock, Eck, Gabba, Millar, Nicolet and Yavetz, as well as that of Mr Griffin. The lectures will be open to all who wish to attend, and no registration or advance notice is necessary. It would be appreciated, however, if anyone who expects to attend would inform the President of Wolfson College Oxford (which leads the Editor to hope that means they might get invited to a birthday party!).

3 more subscriptions makes 364, 24 so far this year, so 400 might be contemplated by 1984.

W. = M.Winterbottom, *Problems in Quintilian* (London 1970).

10.1.11 *sunt autem alia [sc. verba] huius naturae ut idem pluribus vocibus declarent, ... ut 'ensis' et 'gladius'; alia, etiam si propria rerum aliquarum sunt nomina, tropicos [quare] tamen ad eundem intellectum feruntur, ut 'ferrum' et 'mucro'.*

'quare' is best out of the way' (W.). It is easier to agree than to explain the presence of the word in the text. W. refers to 'two extraordinarily unlikely' explanations and then adds 'what may be regarded as a third'. I add a fourth (I hope, less unlikely): that it originated from *gre<ce>* (a marginal note on the preceding word, misread as *gre*).

10.1.27 *praecipueque velut attrita cotidiano actu forensi ingenia optime rerum talium +libertate+ reparantur.*

The jaded orator is refreshed by the reading of poetry.

W. points out that *libertate* has been intruded from two lines later on, and can therefore be replaced by any suitable word that gives an equally good clausula. He suggests *voluptate*; perhaps rightly, but Quintilian's more usual word for the 'charm' of literature is *iucunditas*; e.g. 1.8.11 (of various poets; 10.1.64 (of Simonides), 96 (of Horace), 110 (of Pindar).

10.7.1 *maximus vero studiorum fructus est et velut primus quidam +plius+ longi laboris ex tempore dicendi facultas*

Many editors have either adopted or hankered after *praemium* for *primus*, but none of them has been able to make anything convincing of *plius*. If this conceals a masculine noun there is no reason why both *primus* and *quidam* should not be sound. I suggest *flos*, which makes a good partner for *fructus*.

11.1.51 (a quotation from M.Caelius Rufus) *ne cui vestrum, atque etiam omnium qui ad rem agendam adsunt, meus aut vultus molestior aut vox immoderator aliqua aut denique, quod minimum est, iactantior gestus fuisse videatur.*

If *aliqua* is right *vox* must mean 'word', 'expression', but in conjunction with *vultus* and *gestus* one would expect it to mean 'voice'. Perhaps we should read *aliqua<ndo>*, 'at times'.

11.1.90 *plerumque velut ipsos coneris ratione vincere, quod est mollissimum.*

'And there are a large number of cases where we should attempt to defeat our opponents by reasoning, which forms the gentlest of all methods of attack' (Butler, Loeb edition). This translation ignores the troublesome *velut*, for which W. tentatively suggests *vero*. I think that *ue* may have come from the end of *plerumque*, and that *lut* may be the remnant of *licet*; this would have the advantage of giving *coneris* a clearer construction.

11.3.22 *nec praeparare ab imis sonis vocem ad summos nec semper a contentione condere licet, cum pluribus iudiciis saepe dicendum sit.*

'We cannot always keep our voice stored away, free from the strains of use in the courts' (W.). Perhaps rather 'after the strains of use'. I think that *condere* suggests *condere gladium*; cf. 8, pr.15 *similia gladio condito atque intra vaginam suam haerenti*. The voice is one of the orator's *naturalia instrumenta* (12.5.5). More frequently it is the tongue which is regarded as the speaker's weapon; it must be sharpened (for *linguam acuere* see TLL 1.461.58-61), and can be sheathed (Phaedrus 5.2.10 *nunc conde ferrum et lingua pariter futilem*).

11.3.113 *sed cum aversantes in laevam partem velut propellemus manum, sinister umerus proferendus, ut cum capite ad dextram ferente consentiat.*

'But when, in expressing aversion, we drive as it were our hand to the left, the left shoulder should ... be advanced, that it may move in concert with the head as it inclines to the right' (Watson, Bohn translation). 'The intransitive use [of *ferente*] is very strange' (W.). I think it is impossible; read *vergente*. The same sense is later (§119) expressed by *inclinato in umerum dextrum capite*.

11.3.183 *quare non immerito reprehenditur pronuntiatio vultuosa et gesticulationibus molesta et vocis mutationibus resultans; nec inutiliter ex Graecis veteres transtulerunt quod ab iis sumptum Laenas Popilius posuit, esse hanc imocosam actionem.*

Anyone who suggests an emendation of *mocosam* must also suggest a Greek word of which it could be a translation. The old conjecture *inotiosam*, which would be a translation of *ἀνοχο-λογος* ('restless'), is not a Latin word. Perhaps the Greek word in question is *περίεργος*, which is used by Quintilian at 1.6.19; the noun *περιεργία* (or *periergia*) occurs at 8.3.55, where Quintilian explains it as *supervacua operositas*. In our passage it could have been rendered by *negotiosam*, the conjecture of Halm.

12.2.9 *quae ipsae [sc. res] quanto maiores ac pulchriores viderentur si illas ii docerent qui etiam eloqui praestantissime possunt!*

This is an exclamation, not a question, although it is still mispunctuated as a question in the latest edition (the Budé edition of Cousin), as in practically all its predecessors. The only text I know which gets it right is that of R.G. Austin (edition of Book 12, Oxford 1948).

12.9.8 *at quidam ... , si defecerunt alia, conviciis implent vacua causarum, si contigit veris, si minus fictis.*

Editors abandon the paradosis *contigit* for the conjecture *contingit*, I do not know why (although the change is an easy one); the perfect tense is supported by the clausula (cretic-spondee, as in *si minus fictis*). They do likewise, and with as little justification, at 6.3.26 *cum iis modus contigit* (double-cretic clausula). At 2.17.25 *si ... summa non contigit* and 5.7.19 *id si non contigit* the manuscript evidence is divided, but again I think editors are wrong in preferring the present to the perfect tense, which gives the better rhythm.

Copyright (C) 1982 W.S. Watt.

E.L. HARRISON (Leeds): *Virgil's use of the substitution motif.* LCM 7.9 (Nov. 1982), 127-128

*at Cytherea novas artis, nova pectore uersat
consilia, ...*

A.1.657-8

Venus' maternal instinct prevails when she sees her son in a potentially dangerous situation, and in spite of Jupiter's long-term reassurances, and short-term precaution (the first despatching of Mercury to Carthage) she resolves to take action herself on his behalf, cocooning him in the protective love of Queen Dido. Just as she is motivated by the maternal instinct, so will she play on that same (frustrated) instinct in Dido: she proposes to carry Ascanius off for one night, depositing him in one of her temples in Cythera or Cyprus, and let Cupid (disguised as Ascanius) inject his poison into Dido's system once she has begun to fondle and kiss him as if he were her own child. The dominant mood throughout this episode is Venus' concern for her son's safety: it is stressed by the poet in the narrative, and it forms the basis of Venus' plea to Cupid in the lines that follow. Why then, when the question of the substitution is reached, does she choose such a context to emphasize that Ascanius (rather than Aeneas) is her *maxima cura* (678)? Such a comment would suit her speech in the divine assembly (A.10.18-62), where she pretends to resign herself to Aeneas' failure, and to concentrate her concern on her grandson instead, but here it seems to strike a slightly discordant note. Perhaps we should look at the passage again and reflect on what might lie behind this development.

Venus intends at this point to protect her son with an intervention that will employ substitution as a key element. Now in the *Iliad*, in the one episode during which Aphrodite tried to rescue Aeneas from danger, she in fact failed badly, but Apollo intervened successfully, and made significant use of the substitution device in order to do so (I.5.311-453). Here Venus seeks to ensure Aeneas' safety once more, but will do so in a manner more appropriate to her role as love-goddess (cf. Zeus' words after the *Iliad* fiasco, 5.428ff.). Profiting from that earlier experience, then, she will employ a substitution of her own - an erotic equivalent, as it were, of the phantom duplicate used by Apollo in the *Iliad* (5.449-453). Two features suggest such a connexion between the Virgilian and Homeric passages. Venus will deposit Ascanius in one of her temples, just as Apollo deposited Aeneas in one of his (I.5.445-6); and more specially, as the model for Venus' *me maxima cura* we find that the Homeric Aphrodite used the phrase *ὅς ἐμοὶ πάντων πολὺ φίλτατός ἐστιν* (I.5.378). But that brings us back to our original question. In the *Iliad* Aphrodite used the words to refer to Aeneas. Why then has Virgil chosen to move his equivalent phrase so that it now refers to Ascanius?

The answer would seem to be that, although he did indeed wish to recall the Homeric original by employing this echo, to have given the expression to Venus earlier, when she was concerned with Aeneas (667ff.), would have involved a degree of parallelism he wished to avoid: after all, Aphrodite's action in the *Iliad* had failed. He therefore holds the echo over until now, thereby associating Venus' intervention not with Aphrodite and her failure, but with Apollo's success, and with the substitution that was an important part of that god's manoeuvre. But his own substitution is part of a more complex scheme than the straightforward Homeric rescue, and involves the removal of Ascanius rather than that of Aeneas himself: the phrase thus now finds itself applied to him rather than to Aeneas. The result is not objectionably obtrusive, since grandparents are usually inordinately fond of their grandchildren: but, as I have suggested, it does not perhaps quite suit the general drift of the immediate epic action.

That this approach to the *Aeneid* 1 passage could be on the right lines is suggested by other considerations. In Book 12, when the truce is violated and the unarmed Aeneas is grievously wounded, Venus finally arrives on the scene to effect a magical cure with her use of dittany (383ff.). In a recent article (*Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3[1981], 221ff.) I have suggested that the unusual features of this episode, in which a series of references

to the failure of Apolline medicine culminates in *nihil auctor Apollo | subuenit* A.12.405-6), whereupon Venus successfully intervenes in a sphere that is not really her concern, can perhaps best be seen as a reversal of the *Iliad* 5 episode. If this is correct, then both at the beginning and at the end of the *Aeneid* Virgil can be said to have echoed that passage in such a way as to transform the Homeric tradition, and allow Venus to shake off the association with failure that clung to the Homeric Aphrodite as far as provision for her son's safety was concerned. For however precarious Aeneas' position at Carthage may subsequently become, Venus' earlier manoeuvre on his behalf is still a considerable improvement on that *Iliad* failure.

The suggestion that Virgil drew on *Iliad* 5 with adjustment of the Homeric tradition in mind finds further support if we consider his remarkable use of the substitution motif in *Aeneid* 10, where his purpose is to vindicate Aeneas' reputation rather than that of Venus. Juno is now the deity involved, and the connexion with *Iliad* 5 is established by her at the start of the book (A.10.81-82). As Saint-Beuve observed (*Etude sur Virgile*, 118-9), by Virgil's day the Homeric idea of divine rescue had lost its glitter, and was no longer felt to enhance a hero's status. Virgil therefore lets Juno pour scorn on Aeneas' Homeric rescue in the modern spirit, with the usual distortions thrown in, as she addresses Venus in terms that are strictly relevant to Apollo's role in that rescue rather than her adversary's:

*'tu potes Aenean manibus subducere Graium
proque uiro nebulam et uentos intendere inanibus.'* 10.81-82

Later, however, she resorts to a comparable manoeuvre herself in order to rescue her protégé, fashioning a phantom Aeneas for Turnus to pursue from the battlefield, while the real Aeneas searches in vain for his missing enemy (A.10.633ff.). Juno's scornful reference at the start of the book helps us to recognize this later development for what it surely is - a clever echo of the *Iliad* substitution, with reminiscences of *Iliad* 21.595 - 22.20 (Apollo as Agenor misleading Achilles) and 3.449-50 (Menelaus and Paris), but one which now presents Aeneas as the frustrated superior warrior and Turnus as the hero who is saved by a substitution which has now become so degrading.

Copyright (C) 1982 E.L.Harrison

L.WATSON(Sydney): *Apuleius*, *Apologia* 16

LCM 7.9(Nov.1982), 128-129

In *Apologia* 16, contrasting his own indifference to Aemilianus' morals with the latter's scurrilous attacks on his character, Apuleius remarks *et ego nunquam studui male facta cuiusquam cognoscere, sed semper potius duxi mea peccata tegere quam aliena indagare* (text of R. Helm). Something is surely wrong with *tegere*: 'keeping one's peccata hidden' smacks of hypocritical concealment of shortcomings, a notion to which Apuleius would scarcely lend substance in an *apologia pro se* - the more especially since his opponents, in their prosecution speech, had already taxed him with moral imposture, on the grounds of an allegedly licentious life-style which was inconsistent with his loudly proclaimed devotion to philosophy (Apol.4, 9, 10 & 13: for charges of hypocrisy levelled against philosophers, see E.Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980, 120-121).

Moreover, any suggestion that Apuleius preferred to conceal his peccata is strangely at odds with the earlier bold assertion that he has absolutely nothing to hide: *si verum ... innocentiam eloquentiam esse ... quis ... me ... eloquentior vivat, quippe qui nihil unquam cogitavi quod eloqui non auderem?* (5, 9ff.).

Emendation of *tegere* is called for. Scribnerius (ap. F.Oudendorp, *Apuleii Opera* vol.2, Leiden 1823, p.428) suggested *regere*, Lipsius (*Elect.Lib.* 2.21 = *Opera Omnia* Tom.1, Antwerp 1637, p.336) *degere*, citing Nonius Marcellus 278M. = 427L. *degere est etiam minuere*. Plautus in *Aulularia* (165) 'nunc ego istum, soror, laborem degam et deminuum tibi' (where the MSS., however, give 'demam').

I propose *peccata tergere*¹, 'clear away (i.e. remove) my faults', cf. Seneca, *Her.O.* 907-908 *fonte Cinyphio scelus | sub axe Libyco tersit*, where, it will be noted, *tersit* = *ab-* or *de-* *tersit*, as in the suggested emendation (although *detergere* should not perhaps be ruled out as an alternative emendation - less easy palaeographically, but defensible on the grounds that Apuleius does not in general affect *simplex pro composito*, and shows a liking for this compound: see Oldfather, Canter & Parry, *Index Apuleianus* [Middletown, Conn. 1934] s.v.). Also relevant is Martial 6.1.1-5

*sextus mittitur hic tibi libellus, ... 1
quem si terseris aure diligenti, 3
audebit minus anxius tremensque
magnas Caesaris in manus venire. 5*

where *tergere* apparently means *emendare* in the sense of removing unwanted blemishes from a literary work

1. Probably *tergere* not *tergere*, the first yielding *peccatā tēr|gērē*, a favoured rhythm in Apuleius (cf. M.Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura*, Stuttgart 1927, 250ff. & 324ff.): for the dispute over the conjugation of *tergere* see Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre* 3.274ff.). I am grateful to Professor R.G.M.Nisbet for reading a first draft of this paper, and bringing these and other matters to my attention.

Although metaphorical instances of *tergere* seem to be confined to the examples just cited, already in Cicero the compound form *abstergere* is freely used in the transferred sense of purging undesirable emotions, e.g. *Top.* 86 *aegritudinem abstergens*; *Fam.* 11.24.1 *ista epistula mi omnem metum abstersisses* (further TLL 1.189, 68ff., Weinhold, ALL 6[1889], 215; also Plautus, *Poen.* 969-70), while both *abstergeo* and *detergeo* are used, with greater or lesser freedom, of washing away moral stains or the like, cf. Cicero, *Phil.* 2.91 *quasi fuligine abstersa* ('the soot of Caesar's cremation, with the second sense of ill deeds', Ker in the Loeb ad loc.); Seneca, *NQ* 1 praef. 11 *si sordidum omne deterat* (of the corruption attaching to the soul through contact with the body); Statius, *Silv.* 4.3.86-7 *malumque late | deterges sterilis soli pudorem*; and, elsewhere in the *Apologia* (57) *satis videor ... quod ad sudarium pertineat, omnem criminis maculam deterasisse*. Most striking of all is the frequency with which, in Christian writers, *abstergeo* and *detergeo* are combined with words for sin (sometimes penitential tears are mentioned as a cleansing agent, sometimes the metaphor is unsupported²).

As a final point in favour of *tergere* over *tegere* we might add that it is consistent with the extremely high line which Apuleius takes, in the early part of the *Apologia*, concerning his moral character: so high, in fact, that one is almost surprised to find him admitting to the existence of *peccata*. But since he does, we should expect him to talk of removing, not concealing them.

2. With *peccata*, Ps.-Aug. *Serm.* 95,2 (Migne PL 39, 1927) *si Petrus potuit lacrimarum suarum fusione propria peccata abstergere*, *ibid.* 15,4 (Migne 39, 1772), Cassiod. *Exp. in Psal.* 105,6 (Migne 70, 756) *a se peccata parentum volebat abstergi*, Ambr. *Paenitent.* 2.8.66 (Migne 16, 513), Ruric. *Epist.* 2.15 (Corp. Vindob. 21.397), Hieron. *Epist.* 18.6 (Migne 22.364; with *dedecus*, Prud. *Perist.* 2.453 *absterge, Christe, hoc dedecus*; with *scelus*, Hieron. *Epist.* 61.4 (Migne 22.605) and Ps.-Ambr. *Prec.* 2.15 (Migne 17.761); with *delicta*, Isid. *Syn.* 1.54 (Migne 83.839), with *vitium*, *ibid.* 2.6 (Migne 83.846); with *culpa*, Greg. *Tur. Hist. Franc.* 10.1 (Migne 71, 528); and with *piacula*, Ps.-Tert. *de iud. Dom.* 384 (Tertull. *Opera*, ed. Oehler, vol.2, 781).

Copyright (C) 1982 L. Watson

M.J. Alden (The Queen's University, Belfast): *Pythian X and Pindar's ineptitude*
LCM 7.9 (Nov. 1982), 129-134

The ancient scholiast, commenting on the myth of *Pythian X*, made heavy weather of it. He failed to see how it could be relevant to the purpose of the ode: μέγροι δὲ τούτων ὁ Πίνδαρος καλῶς τὸν ἐπινίκιον γράφει· ἡστοχῆσε δὲ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀλόγῳ παρεμβάσει χρησάμενος (A. B. Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vol. II, Teubner 1910, photographic reprint, Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam 1964, p. 245 46b.).

Commentators throughout the centuries have followed his example, ascribing the apparent unsuitability of the myth to Pindar's youth and inexperience. I give a few of the more recent examples: 'The myth itself, the story of the happy society of the Hyperboreans, has appeared both to the commentators and the modern reader as irrelevant ... But irrelevance was not specially a youthful vice in Pindar ...' (L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, vol. II, London 1930, p. 143); '... nothing flows from it [i.e. the myth], and the story is closed with a convenient commonplace that to the gods nothing is impossible. In all probability this refers to Athena's guidance of Perseus to the land of the Hyperboreans, and if so, the parenthetic nature of vv. 46-48 is made even clearer.' (R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes*, Oxford 1962, p. 9); '... after dwelling on the tale of Perseus among the Hyperboreans, a tale which had no real connection with the athlete celebrated, he rather self-consciously adds several lines of transition, almost as an apology for having digressed from his proper theme.' (Mary A. Grant, *Folktale and Hero-tale Motifs in the Odes of Pindar*, University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, 1967, pp. 1-2.); '... die Verse 30-48 enthalten eine inhaltlich darauf kaum zu beziehende Mythenerzählung, die lediglich Person und Leistung des Geehrten in den mythischen Traditionszusammenhang rückt ...' (A. Dihle, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Stuttgart 1967, p. 48).

Nobody openly accuses Pindar of ineptitude, but it may seem implied. More recently, it has become fashionable to approach Pindaric studies in a humbler frame of mind: 'But when one problem after another yields to analysis, when passages that seem difficult to us at first become clear through comparison with similar passages elsewhere in the odes, we begin to suspect that our own lack of familiarity with this kind of poetry is at fault, not the poet.' (Frank J. Nisetich, *Pindar's Victory Songs*, Johns Hopkins University Press 1980, p. 54). We may not know exactly what Pindar is doing, but we ought to concede that he probably does, since however young and inexperienced he may have been when he wrote *Pythian X*, his experience of the genre was considerably more profound than we can ever hope that ours will be. Bundy has sharply reminded us that 'there is no passage in Pindar and Bakchylides that is not in its primary intent enkomiastie - that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron.' (E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica I*, University of California Press, Berkeley and

Los Angeles, 1962, p.3). In the view of Lloyd-Jones, this is probably 'the Ariadne's clue' to understanding Pindar (H.Lloyd-Jones, 'Modern Interpretations of Pindar: the Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes', *JHS* 93[1973], pp.109-137 at 117): like the great train robbery, the possibility of success must first be entertained if it is to become feasible. Mary R.Lefkowitz, in the preface to her book *The Victory Ode*, Noyes Press, Park Ridge, New Jersey, 1976 (p.i), mentions the 'pervasive despair' which at first fills anyone who tries to read the odes of Pindar in the original Greek, but indicates that this 'can, with patience, be replaced by the continuing pleasure of new insight and understanding' (p.13).

Pythian X is taken to be Pindar's earliest extant work (L.R.Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, vol.11, p.214), but it is no less difficult for that. Pindar's poetry is not like books of exercises for students, which are graded in difficulty. Nevertheless, I believe that the myth of *Pythian X* is as relevant to Pindar's subject as is any of the myths in his later work, and that this early poem is as technically and artistically well-developed as any of the later odes. Despite its early date, it contains a great many of the devices which are found in poems which are admitted to be mature.

The most helpful and detailed treatment of the myth of *Pythian X* is to be found in A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*, Berlin & New York 1971. Köhnken makes the point that the Hyperboreans have escaped Nemesis (lines 43-44) and that this is the reason for their blessedness (pp.172-3). Nemesis, according to Köhnken, includes death: Nemesis (line 44) and θάνατος (line 48) complement each other; Nemesis, which the Hyperboreans have escaped, receives the meaning of death, which Perseus brings to the people of Seriphos (p.180): that Perseus brought death to the people of Seriphos is the reason why he was rewarded with a visit to the Hyperboreans: 'Für diese Taten belohnten die Götter den Perseus mit einem Aufenthalt bei den seligen Hyperboeern und der Teilnahme an ihren glänzenden Freudenfesten' (p.178); 'der "steinerne Tod", den er den Seriphiern bringt, und für den der Sieg über die Gorgo Voraussetzung ist, ist die gerechte Strafe für die Hybris des Polydektes von Seriphos' (p.179).

The implication, which Köhnken appears to make, that the Hyperboreans are, for Pindar, deathless, may not be justified, though perhaps, like their counterparts, the Aithiopians, they live to a great age. The Aithiopians usually live ἐς εἰκοσὶ τε καὶ ἑκατὸν (Herodotus III 23 1): How and Wells (W.W.How & J.Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford 1912 [corrected impression 1928], p.314) can adduce no direct evidence for the longevity of the Hyperboreans, but imply it by comparing them with the Lapps, an 18th century type of earthly felicity. The language used by Pindar in speaking of the state of the Hyperboreans seems rather to echo that used by Hesiod, *Works and Days* 91-2, when he describes the men who lived before Pandora opened her jar, and 112-116, when he describes the first race of men, who died in their sleep, without hateful old age:

νόσοι δ' οὐτε γήρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται
 ἱερῶ γενεῶ· πόνων δὲ καὶ μαχῶν ἄτερ
 οἰκέοισι φυχόντες
 ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν.

Pythian X 41-44

and νόσῳ ἄτερ τε καὶ γῆρας ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνου
 νόσῳ τ' ἀργαλέων, αἱ τ' ἀνδράσι κῆρας ἔδωκαν.

Works & Days 91-92

and νόσῳ ἄτερ τε πόνων καὶ οἰζύος, οὐδὲ τι δειλὸν
 γήρας ἔπην, αἰεὶ δὲ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὁμοῖοι
 τέρποντ' ἐν θαλίῃσι, καὶ ἔκτοσθεν ἀπάντων·
 θνήσκον δ' ὥσθ' ὕπνῳ δεδιμμένοι.

Works & Days 113-116

Nemesis, as Pindar frequently indicates, is a factor to beware of when composing epinikia: one must always take care not to excite the righteous indignation of the gods when praising a mortal victor (for references, see C.M.Bowra, *Pindar*, Oxford 1964, 190). Pindar has been careful to point out that Hippokleas' victory has been achieved with the assistance of Apollo (lines 10-13), and he later explains that, with the aid of the gods, no achievement seems unlikely:

ἐμοὶ δὲ θαυμάσαι.

ἐπ. γ' θεῶν τελεσάντων οὐδὲν ποτε φαίνεται
 ἔμμεν ἀπιστον.

Pythian X 48-50

However, before making his point about the omnipotence of the gods, Pindar gives us several examples of achievement. The first is of the achievement of failure rather than of success:

ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς αὐτῷ.

Pythian X 27

This is a reference to the attempt of the giants, Otus and Ephialtes, to pile Pelion on Ossa, and thus to scale heaven:

Ὅσσα ἐπ' οὐλύμῳ μέμασαν θέμεν, αὐτὰρ ἐπ' Ὀσσῇ
 Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἔν' οὐρανὸς ἀμβατὸς εἴη.

Odyssey XI 315-316

But their attempt was an act of hybris, and the gods did not, of course, assist their efforts, which were therefore doomed to failure (one sometimes wonders whether 'the youthful Pindar' later in his career became aware of the need to 'spell it out', and whether that is not why his later work has been better appreciated by critics).

The second example of achievement is of the accomplishment of an ἀδύνατον: how Perseus managed to find the road to the 'gathering' (so Farnell, p.141, translates ἀγῶνα, line 30: but the choice of word, and its ambiguity in its context, may be no accident) of the

Hyperboreans, and to share in their feasts. The similarities to Odysseus reaching the Phai- 131
 akians are strong: οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ διερὸς βροτὸς οὐδὲ γένηται,

ὃς κεν Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἱκῆται
 δηϊότητα φέρων· μάλα γὰρ φίλοι ἀθανάτοισιν.

οἰκόμεν δ' ἀπάνευθε πολυκλύστῳ ἐνὶ πόντῳ,
 ἔσχατοι, οὐδέ τις ἄμμι βροτῶν ἐπιμύογεται ἄλλος

Odyssey VI 201-205

(Köhnen p.169). Even the language, as if to reinforce the point, has strong Odyssean echoes:
 compare

περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον

πλόον· ναυσὶ δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἴων <κέν> εὐροῖς

Pythian X 28-30

ἐς Ὑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυματῶν ὁδόν.

Odyssey XI 58

ἔφθης πεζὸς ἴων ἢ ἐγὼ σὺν νηὶ μελαίνῃ.

οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί σε (ἐ *XVI 224*) πεζὸν οἶσμαι ἐνθάδ' ἰκέσθαι. *Odyssey I 173,*
XIV 59 XVI 224

ἢ πεζὸν ἔοντ', ἦν μὴ τις ἔχη εὐεργέα νῆα.

Odyssey XI 159

It seems clear that Pindar is emphasizing the accomplishment of an apparent ἄδύνατον, and
 contrasting it with the failed attempt of line 27, by pointing out that it was achieved with
 the assistance of the gods

ἀγέτο δ' Ἀθήνα.

Pythian X 45

ἄδύνατα, which are still a feature of Greek tradition (M.Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge 1974, p.181), are frequently achieved in folk-stories. Stith Thompson, in his *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*, vol.III, Copenhagen 1956, pp.456-462, gives what he sees as real ἄδύνατα, but many of the other tasks which he lists at pp.449-479 are also ἄδύνατα: one of these (H 1153, p.473) is trying to sell three old women: the Devil finds that nobody wants them. Again, the threat of some awful fate may spur the hero on to greater efforts (Stith Thompson p.449): this fate may await the hero himself, or someone he holds dear, and he may be assisted by divine aid or sorcery (Stith Thompson pp.454-456). There is also the instance of the fair maiden who, for a month, daily succeeded in producing impossible amounts of spun flax in fulfilment of the bargain by which she married the king, but did so with the aid of an impet to which she was obliged to belong unless she could guess its name. She found out the name from her husband, who inadvertently revealed it to her: after he had happened upon the impet as it sang to itself while spinning (J.Jacobs, *English Fairy Tales*, London 1890, 'Tom Tit Tot' at pp.1-8, - Tom Tit Tot looks suitably cowed in the illustration on p.8).

There are also literary examples of ἄδύνατα in the natural world. The chorus of the Golden Lamb in Euripides' *Electra*, 699-746, mentions at 726-8 the phenomenon of the sun changing its course, although the women of the chorus claim not to believe in this shocking event (737-746). J.D.Denniston, in his edition (Oxford 1939, p.141), finds traces in this chorus, in which the change is to a westward course, of another version 'in which Atreus, after the fraud, agrees with Thyestes, at the prompting of Hermes, that he shall recover his kingdom if the sun's course is changed - in this version to an eastward course'.

Sometimes an ἄδύνατον may be assigned to a hero in order to get rid of him (Stith Thompson p.479), as the quest for the Golden Fleece was assigned to Jason and as the king of Lycia sent Bellerophon to kill the Chimaira. Bellerophon killed it θεῶν τεράεσσι πισθήσας (*Iliad* 6.183): this is probably an expurgated reference to Pegasus, since in these cases the hero is quite likely to enlist divine aid (Stith Thompson p.454), if he is not helped by the king's daughter, who sometimes employs sorcery, as did Medea. In any case, the hero, παρὰ προσδοκίαν, accomplishes the impossible task.

In *Pythian X*, then, Pindar appears to be attempting to point up the difference between hybriatic and proper mortal striving: the giants' attempt (line 27) was wicked, but Perseus, since he was supported by the gods, was able to accomplish even an ἄδύνατον. The implication is, of course, that the mortal striving of Hippokleas and his family is supported by the gods because their success has been achieved with divine assistance - by definition, for have they not won? - and in a shame culture you always say that your exploits have been performed with divine aid, whatever we may privately think you privately thought.

In case we have not yet taken his point, Pindar gives us two more, similarly contrasted, examples of mortal striving, presented in chiasmus with the first two. Whereas before we had the impious attempt of the giants on heaven, followed by Perseus' successful efforts to reach the land of the Hyperboreans, so now we have Perseus' successful and righteous exploit with the Gorgon's head contrasted with the impiety (which is not explicitly mentioned) which he punished. A very condensed passage (lines 46-49) is paralleled in its compactness by *Pythian IV* 247-252 and *Olympian I* 87-88: in each of these instances Pindar, after having dwelt at some length on an aspect of the myth which is important for his purposes, but which would ordinarily be considered trivial, passes over in highly compressed language the main points of the myth. So here Pindar reminds us that Perseus, with divine assistance, managed to kill the Gorgon Medousa and, bringing back her head, turned the islanders of Seriphos into stone. Mission accomplished, but where is the unsuccessful mortal striving? The answer is given by Pindar only allusively, in lines 46-49, but these lines, however enigmatic, are essential to Pindar's laudatory purposes in writing an epinikion: we cannot afford to regard them as 'this appendage to the myth ... best accounted for by the poet's desire to round off the story of Perseus by adding his most famous exploit ...' (R.W.B.Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes*, p.9).

Perseus' 'most famous exploit' is most fully recounted in a fragment of the historian

(or genealogist) Pherekydes of Athens (*FGH* i 3 F11), which for the reader's convenience I am permitted to quote in full (Σ Apollonius Rhodius IV 1515):

Περσέως ἐν Σερίῳ μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς διαγόντος παρὰ Δίκτυι καὶ ἠβήσαντος, Πολυδέκτης ὁ Δίκτυος ὁμομήτριος ἀδελφὸς βασιλεὺς Σερίῳ τυγχάνων ἰδὼν τὴν Δανάην ἡρώσθη αὐτῆς, ἠπόρει δὲ συγκοιμηθῆναι. καὶ παραινέσας ἄριστον ἐκέλευε πολλοὺς καὶ αὐτὸν Περσέα. Περσέως δὲ πυθομένου ἐπὶ τίνι ὁ ἔρανος εὐωχεῖται, τοῦ δὲ φήσαντος ἐπὶ ἵπῳ, Περσεὺς εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς Γοργόνης κεφαλῇ. μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἔρανον τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ, ὅτε οἱ ἄλλοι ἔρανισταὶ τὸν ἵππον ἀπεκρίμιζον, καὶ Περσεὺς. ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἐδέχετο, ἀπῆτει δὲ τὴν τῆς Γοργόνης κεφαλὴν κατὰ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ κοίμῃ, τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ λήψεσθαι ἔφη. ὁ δὲ ἀνισθεὶς ἀπέρχεται ὀλοφύρομενος τὴν συμφοράν εἰς τὸ ἔσχατον τῆς νήσου. Ἑρμῆς δὲ αὐτῷ ὁφθεὶς καὶ πεῦσιν αὐτῷ προσαγαγὼν μανθάνει τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ θρήνου. ὁ δὲ ἡγεῖται θαρρεῖν εἰπὼν πρῶτον παρὰ τοῦ φόρκου Γραίας, Περκρηδῶ καὶ Ἐνυῶ καὶ Δεινῶ, Ἀθηναῖς φθασάσης, καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπαιρεῖται τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν καὶ τὸν ὀδόντα ὀρεγουσὶν ἀλλήλαις. αἱ δὲ αἰσθανόμεναι βοῶσι καὶ ἱκετεύουσι τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ταῖς τὸν δόντα ἀποδοῦναι. ἐνὶ γὰρ αἱ τρεῖς ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἐκέχρητο. ὁ δὲ Περσεὺς φησιν αὐτὸν ἔχειν καὶ ἀποδῶσιν, ἐὰν αὐτῷ ὑποδείξωσιν τὰς νύμφας, αἱ ἔχουσι τὴν Ἄϊδος κυνὴν καὶ τὰ πέδιλα τὰ ὑπόπτερα καὶ τὴν κίβισιν. αἱ δὲ αὐτῷ πράττουσι, καὶ ὁ Περσεὺς ἀποδίδωσι. καὶ ἀπελθὼν πρὸς τὰς νύμφας σὺν Ἑρμῇ, αἰτήσας τε καὶ λαβὼν ὑποδεσμεῖται τὰ ὑπόπτερα πέδιλα καὶ τὴν κίβισιν περιβάλλει κατὰ τῶν ὤμων καὶ τὴν Ἄϊδος κυνὴν τῇ κεφαλῇ περιτίθῃσιν. εἴτα ἔρχεται πετόμενος πρὸς τὸν ὠκεανὸν καὶ τὰς Γοργόνας, συνεπομένων αὐτῷ Ἑρμοῦ τε καὶ Ἀθηναῖς. ταύτας δὲ κοιμώμενας εὐρίσκει. ὑποτιθενται δὲ αὐτῷ οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ πῶς χρὴ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμῖν ἀπεστραμμένον, καὶ δεικνύουσι Μέδουσάν, ἥ μόνη ἦν θνητῇ τῶν Γοργόνων. ὁ δὲ πλησίον γενόμενος ἀποτέμνει, καὶ ἐνδεὶς εἰς τὴν κίβισιν φεύγει. αἱ δὲ αἰσθόμεναι διώκουσι καὶ αὐτὸν οὐχ ὀρώσιν. Περσεὺς δὲ εἰς Σέρικον γενόμενος ἔρχεται παρὰ Πολυδέκτην καὶ κελεύει συναθροῖσθαι τὸν λαόν, ὅπως δείξῃ αὐτοῖς τὴν τῆς Γοργόνης κεφαλὴν, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐὰν ἴδωσιν λίθοι ἐμελλον ἐσεσθαι. ὁ δὲ Πολυδέκτης ἀλλότῃς τὸν ὄχλον κελεύει αὐτὸν διεκνύειν. ὁ δὲ ἀποστρεφόμενος ἔξαιρετ' ἐκ τῆς κιβίσσεως καὶ δεικνυσὶν. οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες λίθοι ἐγένοντο. ἡ δὲ Ἀθηναῖα παρὰ Περσέως λαβοῦσα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐντίθῃσιν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῆς αἰγίδα. τὴν δὲ κίβισιν Ἑρμῇ ἀποδίδωσι καὶ τὰ πέδιλα καὶ τὴν κυνὴν. <ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδίδωσι> ταῖς νύμφαις. ἱστορεῖ Φερεκίδης ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ.

Polydektes, we learn, is afflicted by a passion for Danae which he intends to gratify. Pherekydes does not explain that this was hybriistic, but Pindar may well have thought that it was, for Polydektes is aspiring to the happiness of Zeus in aspiring to the possession of Danae, already the bride of Zeus, and mother by him of Perseus. In *Pythian II* he does use the word ὕβρις of Ixion, another example of one who aspired to the happiness of Zeus (Hera), but who succeeded only in embracing a cloud (lines 21-49: ὕβρις line 28, and in *Pythian XII*, which also uses the myth of Perseus, he indicates his disapproval of the conduct of Polydektes in lines 14-15 λυγρόν τ' ἔρανον Πολυδέκτην
ὄν λέχος.

ἦνκε ματρὸς τ' ἔμπεδον

δουλοσύνην τὸ τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος.

Polydektes is not only prepared to aspire to a happiness which is not κατ' αὐτὸν ... μέτρον (*Pythian II* 34): he is foolish in other ways as well. He does not know, as does Pindar, the σοφός (*Pythian X* 23) that θεῶν τελεσάντων οὐδὲν ποτε φαίνεται

ἔμμεν ἀπιστον,

Pythian X 49-50

and so he asks for an ἀδύνατον: he tells Perseus to bring him the Gorgon's head. This is an example of a task or quest which is designed to get rid of the hero, who is not intended to return and call his taskmaster's bluff (Stith Thompson p.479: when Perseus spontaneously introduces the idea of the Gorgon's head, as he does in Pherekydes, he must have been tricked into doing so, as when his horse is refused ἀνισθεὶς ἀπέρχεται ὀλοφύρομενος. Perhaps he suggested it as an impressive gift for the courtship of Hippodameia, which is what Apollodorus says the horses were for, *Bibl. II* 4.2. There are overtones of the quest in which the 'hero' is to perish in the reaction of the αἰώνες among the Athenians to the self-imposed task of Kleon, Thucydides IV 28.4-5). Further, a dreadful fate awaits Danae if Perseus does not go in quest of the Gorgon's head and obtain it: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ κοίμῃ, τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ λήψεσθαι ἔφη (Pherekydes line 7 above; Stith Thompson p.449).

To ask for the Gorgon's head is in any case foolish: how does one know what is in the bag unless one looks, and if one looks ... Polydektes is unaware that if one asks for an ἀδύνατον, one is liable to get it. The Perseus myth is used by Pindar in *Pythian X* as an example both of what can be achieved with the assistance of the gods - slaughter of the Gorgon and righteous avenging of hybris - and of what is doomed to fail without divine assistance, i.e. Polydektes' designs on a bride of Zeus. The implication is surely that Hippokleas can, with the help of the gods, which at the moment he seems to have, aspire even to feats which at first seem impossible, as long as he prevents his aspirations from becoming hybriistic.

Pindar prevents himself from continuing with the story of Perseus by means of a 'hush passage', lines 51-52 (he has finished with it anyway, it has served his purpose, and he has no intention of degenerating into idle mythography). This kind of interruption device is also found in work admitted to be mature: the most famous example is probably *Olympian I*, lines 52-53, where Pindar refuses to discuss even the possibility that the goddess Demeter may, while grieving for Persephone, have absentmindedly gnawed at the shoulder of Pelops: cf. also *Nemean IV*, lines 69-72, where he refrains from telling the whole story of the children of Aeacus: in both passages he uses the word ἀπορα. He never explains why he will not continue with a myth, but it is clear that he uses 'hush passages' when the myth is taking

him where it is not a good idea to go, for a poet who would, ideally, speak everyone fair: in this case, a naive interpretation might be that if Pindar proceeds he will find himself discussing the adulteries of Zeus. These are, however, most unlikely to have worried Pindar, and the most probable reason for his pulling himself up short is that if he goes on, he will find himself mentioning the fact that Perseus killed his grandfather, Acrisius, at Larissa (FGH i 3 F12). He has already remarked that Hippokleas, by his victory, is keeping up the family traditions:

τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς ἐμβέβαιον ἔχουσιν πατρός, *Pythian X* 13

but clearly feels that the tendency should be kept under control.

Pindar was sophisticated: he may well have appreciated the Oedipal tendencies of Perseus, whose birth had been counter-indicated by an oracle (Apollodorus *Bibl.* II 4.1), who had been exposed as an infant, and who killed his mother's unwanted suitor by design as well as his grandfather 'by accident'. In the former he resembles Telemachus as described by Edmund Leach in his list of variants on the Oedipus story (E. Leach, *Lévi Strauss*, London, Fontana Modern Masters 1970, p.79 ODYSSEUS: father merges with son and destroys the would-be paramours') and in the latter was he avenging Acrisius' treatment of his mother? Another reason for abandoning the Perseus myth in good time may have been Perseus' alleged combat with Dionysius when the god campaigned against Argos with women from Aegean islands (Pausanias II 20.4 & 22.1), which was hardly something that Hippokleas should be encouraged to emulate.

The myth of Pindar's stay among the Hyperboreans is not only relevant to Pindar's purpose in providing an example of proper mortal striving properly rewarded. The Pythian games at which Hippokleas has won a victory are celebrated in honour of Apollo, and the land of the Hyperboreans, which Pindar has made the mise-en-scène of his myth, is visited by Apollo every year, in the same way as Poseidon pays visits to the Aithiopians, their antipodes, in the *Odyssey* (I 23-25). Apollo is associated with the Muses in his patronage of music and dancing, in which the Hyperboreans are engaged when Perseus arrives at their ἀγῶνα. LSJ⁹ cite this passage under the primary sense of ἀγών, I 1 'gathering, assembly ... esp. assembly met to see games', and indeed most of the earlier meanings of the word appear to be connected with assemblies for the viewing of games and contests (LSJ⁹ 'freq. in II.23'). We shall see the significance of this below.

Pythian X has led critics to become involved in long discussions of where the Hyperboreans live, and what routes might be taken to reach them (A.B. Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* II p.248 nr.72b; Charles Dugas, 'Observations sur la Légende de Persée', *REG* 69[1956], 3-6; J.D.P. Bolton, *Aristeas of Proconessus*, Oxford 1962, pp.70-71; G. Méautis, *Pindare le Dorien*, Neuchâtel 1962, pp.38-41). However, it may well be that Pindar, without wishing to press the point too far, is implying that the Thessalians are the Hyperboreans, as already seen by Gildersleeve: 'The land of the Hyperboreans is a glorified Thessaly' (B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1885, p.350). Farnell found reasons why Thessaly could be seen as a 'Hyperborean' land (*The Cults of the Greek States* vol.IV, Oxford 1907, pp.98-105 esp. p.104: *The Works of Pindar* vol.II, pp.217-8) and points out that 'Pindar is our first and sole authority for the visit of Perseus to the Hyperboreans; for though it is mentioned by Simmias of Rhodes (Barber and Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, p.104), he has obviously borrowed it from Pindar' (*Works of Pindar* vol.II p.217).

Pindar, then, rather than attempting to be his own mythographer, appears to be paying an elaborate compliment to his Thessalian hosts. For though Perseus may not, in any of our other sources, have gone to see the Hyperboreans, he did go to see the Thessalians, and killed his grandfather with a discus at games in Larissa, so that, in an epinikion, one cannot refer openly to his visit. It is safer to disguise it as a visit to the Hyperboreans, thus avoiding any inauspicious references to what Perseus did among the Thessalians, while at the same time endowing the Thessalians with all the graces of a people recognised as particularly dear to Apollo. The Hyperboreans are exempt from the retribution of Nemesis for improper aspirations (πυρόντες ὑπέρβουλον Νέμεσιν lines 43-44), which is always a risk for a victor in the games, and are one of the types of earthly happiness.

The reference to Perseus' stay among the Hyperboreans as a reward for his divinely assisted exploits is, then, meant to refer to Hippokleas' brief enjoyment of his mortal success, as Köhnken has pointed out (*Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* p.181). But it refers not only to Hippokleas, but also to Pindar: Pindar has, in this ode, found it expedient to equate the Thessalians with the Hyperboreans, and it is likely that he, Pindar, may have gone to stay among the Thessalians/'Hyperboreans' while composing his ode and training the chorus for its performance. It is probably true that some of Pindar's odes, especially the Syracusan ones, may have been commissioned by 'mail order', so to speak, but in many instances Pindar did travel to the courts of his patrons and refers frequently to their generous hospitality (e.g. *Olympian* I 10-17 & 103) and to their appreciation of, and expertise in, music and dancing (e.g. *Olympian* I 14-17).

Since Pindar says in *Pythian X*

πέποιθα ξενίᾳ προσανέει θάρρατος (line 64)

there is no need to suppose that he did not travel to Thessaly to deal with the performance of this ode (though we cannot hope to prove that he did). If this is the case, the references

to the musical performances by maiden choruses (line 38) among the Hyperboreans at their ἀγῶνα may be balanced by references to the Thessalian victory festival for Hippokleas (lines 55-59) at which Pindar is responsible for the music. He cannot say, in so many words, that the Hyperboreans have games, and are celebrating a victory in them (though this is what he seems to imply, and note that as they feast they bind up their hair ἑλύνει χουρῶν - and the prize in the Pythian games was a crown of bay leaves), as there is, so far as I know, no evidence for games dedicated to Apollo among the Hyperboreans. If Pindar had found it convenient to make the Thessalians the Phaiakians, he could have been more direct.

Pindar, then, is using three examples of finely balanced mortal happiness, of which one, the visit of Perseus to the Hyperboreans, is used to unite the other two. Of these other two, the one which looks us straight in the eye is the victory of Hippokleas, which his family, aware of the ephemeral nature of human success and triumph, have thought it wise to have immortalized by Pindar. The happiness which Perseus experienced during his stay among the Hyperboreans was short-lived, but Pindar is not going to mention either that he killed his grandfather and was exiled or that he fought with Dionysus. Similarly, Hippokleas has present happiness but cannot expect it to last for ever:

τὰ δ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἀτέκμαστον προνοήσαι

Pythian X 63.

Pindar frequently remarks in his odes how different people strive after different forms of attainment and happiness (Pythian X.60; Olympian I 113). The implication, spelt out in Olympian I 99-103 is that Hiero has achieved his own highest glory by his victory, and that Pindar has also achieved his own personal highest glory by being the top poet praising the supreme achievement. Pindar was presumably aware at the time that he wrote Pythian X that there were other games and other victors with more money to splash about than Hippokleas' family, and did not wish to present as supreme either the achievement of Hippokleas or his own happiness in praising it. He was, however, prepared to rate his stay among the Thessalians as a stay among a people who enjoyed the highest form of happiness known to man. He was also aware that his present happiness would, like that of Perseus and of Hippokleas, run out, and that, if he wanted to repeat it, he would have to get another commission.

Copyright (C) 1982 M.J.Alden

J.GEIGER (Hebrew University of Jerusalem): *Cornelius Nepos and the authorship of the book on foreign generals.* LCM 7.9 (Nov.1982), 134-136

The attribution of the book *de excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium* to Cornelius Nepos has been generally accepted since the middle of last century. The most serious assault on it, by G.F.Unger, 'Der sogenannte Cornelius Nepos', *Abh.München XVI.1* (1881), 127ff., was sharply criticized and, eventually, ignored and all but forgotten. Yet recently the theory has been resurrected by P.L.Schmidt and has even been lent an aura of authority by the place of its appearance - though few scholars would have expected to find it in a discussion of the sources of the anonymous *de viris illustribus* (P.L.Schmidt, *RE Suppl.XV* [1978], 1641ff. s.v. 'Victor no.69', 'Das Corpus Aurelianum und Sextus Aurelius Victor'). Fortunately it is possible to discuss Schmidt's theory of the authorship of the book on Foreign Generals separately from the wider issues raised by his far-reaching hypothesis concerning the sources of the *de viris illustribus*. The following brief recapitulation of the evidence is offered in keeping with a Biblical injunction (*Leviticus* 19.14) - lest Time and Connivance turn a stumblingblock into a signpost.

1) In the absence of external evidence (for no one takes seriously the attribution to Aemilius Probus, based as it is on a misunderstanding of the subscription epigram), one must rely solely on internal evidence for identifying the author. Absolute certainty is therefore excluded; but, it will be maintained, the internal evidence strongly favours Cornelius Nepos. Since the evidence is circumstantial, not only the separate weight of each argument, but also their cumulative force should be taken into account. The number of separate and independent arguments all pointing in the same direction amounts in itself to an important consideration.

2) The following arguments point towards Nepos as the author of the book:

a) the book was transmitted with works of Nepos; b) it is addressed to a close friend of Nepos and one who was deeply interested in historical literature; c) it belongs to a series similar to the one attested for Nepos; d) it is composed in a style greatly resembling that of Nepos; e) the date of composition agrees with that of Nepos' *de viris illustribus*. We will discuss each point in turn.

a) The MSS tradition. In the MSS which attribute it erroneously to Aemilius Probus, the book on Foreign Generals is followed by excerpts from Nepos transmitted under his own name (these have never been questioned by Unger and Schmidt, or by anyone else, to the best of my knowledge). It is easy to explain how a misunderstanding of the subscription epigram (addressed to the Emperor Theodosius I or II) led to the substitution of Probus' name for that of the author, whoever he may have been. But if this was not Nepos, how did works of different authors come to be associated in the MSS? Schmidt, aware of the difficulty, denounces the holders of the commonly accepted view (he names Wissowa, Schanz-Hosius and Traube) as ignorant of the history of MS attributions, and bases his case on the *Corpus Aurelianum*. But the *Corpus* is anything but a random collection. As Schmidt himself makes clear, the reason for lumping together the *origo gentis Romanae*, the *de viris illustribus* and Victor's *Caesares* was the wish to provide a full history of Rome from its

beginnings to the time of the compilation. But what could have been the purpose of joining together the book on Foreign Generals with excerpts of Nepos' Roman Lives? Unfortunately Schmidt does not offer a solution.

b) The Dedication. The book on Foreign Generals is dedicated to Atticus. Atticus was a close friend of Nepos (Nepos, *Atticus* passim; cf. Cicero, *Att.* 16.5.5 & 14.4) and encouraged him to publish, at the very least, a *volumen*-length Life of Cato (Nepos, *Cato* ad fin.). Obviously Atticus, the author of such historical works as the *Liber annalis*, the *Imagines* and the family histories of a number of Roman aristocratic *gentes* as well as the monograph on the consulate of Cicero, all duly listed by Nepos (*Atticus* 18), was eminently suited to be the dedicatee of a biographical series on Foreign and Roman Generals (for which see below). Although I will defer to a later occasion a full discussion of the relations between Nepos and Atticus, and of Atticus' influence on the series of Lives of Generals, nevertheless one point may be mentioned here to illustrate them.

In a well known passage of Cicero's *Brutus* (42-43) Atticus is made to correct the prevalent view on Themistocles' death by relying on the authority of Thucydides, *qui et Atheniensis erat et summo loco natus summusque vir et paulo aetate posterior*. Similarly in the book on Foreign Generals the authority of Thucydides is preferred to the story of the suicide by means of bull's blood (*Them.* 10.4). The reasons for preferring Thucydides are stated a few lines earlier (9.1) and strikingly recall those of the *Brutus*: *sed ego potissimum Thucydidem credo, quod et aetate proximus de iis, qui illorum temporum historiam reliquerunt, et eiusdem civitatis fuit*. It is only exceptionally that our author states his reasons for preferring certain sources - what better explanation for it than the wish to pay a compliment to the dedicatee of the book? (It is beside the point that Nepos enters into a rather clumsy discussion of a tongue-in-cheek remark).

Schmidt rejects the identification of the Atticus of the dedication with Cicero's friend on the grounds that in the Life of Hannibal (13.1) Atticus is referred to in the third person and as if dead (*Atticus ... in annali suo scriptum reliquit*). But it is almost universally agreed that the fate of the book on Foreign Generals was similar to that of the Life of Atticus, which was expanded and published in a second edition after his death (evidence for the second edition in Schanz-Hosius I⁴.158; an unconvincing attempt to deny the second edition is H. Rahn, 'Die Atticus-Biographie und die Frage der zweiten Auflage der Biographiensammlung des Cornelius Nepos', *H* 85[1957], 205ff.; see also R. Stark, 'Zur Atticus-Vita des Cornelius Nepos', *RhM* 107[1964], 175f.). The existence of a second edition fully accounts both for the reference to Atticus in the third person as well as for the use of the past tense.

c) The Economy of the Work. The two undoubtedly authentic extant works of Nepos, the Lives of Cato and of Atticus, are, according to the evidence of the MSS, extracts from a work *de historicis Latinis*; such a title presupposes the existence of a work on Greek historians; exactly such a work is referred to by the author of the book on Foreign Generals as his own composition (*Dio* 3.2 *sed de hoc in eo libro plura sunt exposita, qui de historicis Graecis conscriptus est*). And conversely, fragments expressly attributed to Nepos from the lives of Marcellus and Lucullus, and possibly from a number of other Lives (see *H* 109[1981], 96ff.), admirably fit a book on Roman Generals promised at the end of the book on Foreign Generals (*Hann.* ad fin.). An attempt at the reconstruction of the series *de viris illustribus* (of which these books presumably formed parts) is not needed here. Schmidt's arguments for the differences between the two works (as e.g. col. 1642) seem to me circular and to rest only on the assumption that we are dealing with two different authors.

d) Language and Style. Unger drew attention to a great number of differences between the style of the book on Foreign Generals and that of the undoubted works of Nepos. Subsequent critics of his hypothesis have pointed out an even greater number of marked similarities (for a good survey of Unger and his critics see R. Bitschowsky, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 72[Nepos 1878-1891, 1892], 75ff. By all accounts both similarities and dissimilarities do exist. Schmidt attributes the similarities to imitation, a doubtful hypothesis even if we are to judge Nepos by the *Atticus*. On the other hand the stylistic differences can be accounted for by the position of the book on Foreign Generals in the series *de viris illustribus*. Again, I defer a full discussion to a later occasion while drawing attention to two points.

1) In Nepos' *de viris illustribus* the books on Generals constitute an exception since only they belong to the genre of political biography (I have tried to show in *Latomus* 38[1979], 662ff., that Nepos never composed books on Kings). 2) These books were written very late in Nepos' life, and were possibly his last composition, added, as an afterthought, to the *de viris illustribus*. The Life of Atticus was composed between c.35 and March 31st 32, the second edition between 29 and 27 (evidence in Schanz-Hosius I⁴.157f.), and since Nepos was born c.109 he must have been approaching the end of his eighth decade while composing them.

e) Date. The book on Foreign Generals does not include any safe clue to its date of composition. However, the criticisms of the veterans' behaviour in his own time (*Eum.* 8.2) fit perfectly an author of the triumviral period, such as Nepos, and are not easily attributed to an Augustan writer such as Hyginus. The identification (by Schmidt and Unger) of Sulpicius Blitho, mentioned in *Hann.* 13.1, with the Augustan Sulpicius Galba does not rest on solid evidence: the author is nowhere else mentioned and cannot be identified with any known person (cf. *HRR* I.CCCLXXIX).

3) Surely all this adds up to a very strong argument for the attribution to Nepos. On

136 what rests the rival claim of Hyginus, the candidate of Unger and Schmidt? As far as one can see, on two points only: Hyginus too was the author of a series *de viris illustribus*, and he too may have had an acquaintance, though an obscure one, by the name of Atticus. The claim that Ampelius, who used the book on Foreign Generals as well as Hyginus, would have used only one source, rather than Nepos and Hyginus for different sections of his work, is only an assumption.

4) We will be well advised not to draw conclusions from the merits or otherwise of the book. Schmidt believes that Hyginus was a serious scholar, the successor of Varro and entrusted by Augustus with the composition of the *elogia* in his Forum. He also believes that Hyginus, as a Greek, could have believed that it was Scipio Africanus, rather than his father, who suffered defeats at the hands of Hannibal on the Rhone, the Po and at Trebia, and that it is therefore not necessary to correct the false statement in the MSS at *Hann.* 6.1. By similar reasoning it could be argued that only a Roman, therefore Nepos, could have confused Miltiades with his uncle of the same name (*Milt.* 1), though the same confusion is to be found also in a Greek, Pausanias (6.19.6). Exhaustive analysis of what various authors did and did not do is better than *a priori* assumptions of what they could or could not.

5) For the question of method is important. In higher criticism, as in *Quellenforschung*, it is easier to attribute works to lost rather than to surviving authors. Lost authors can always be made to fit the mould invented by modern scholarship. Extant authors, on the other hand, are troublesome in that they present real problems for many of which we do not - and cannot - have answers. If there is a lesson to be learned from the renewal of the controversy about the authorship of the book on Foreign Generals it is, perhaps, that what are often thought to be only the excesses of nineteenth century hypercriticism can still be found in the latest supplement (1978) of the venerable Pauly-Wissowa.

I wish to thank my friend Dr Hannah Cotton for her valuable help.

Copyright (C) 1982 J.Geiger

JOHN MOLES(Bangor): *Plutarch, Crassus 13,4-5, and Cicero's de consiliis suis*

LCM 7.9(Nov.1982), 136-137

In the course of a stimulating study of Cicero's *de consiliis suis* E.Rawson (LCM 7.8[Oct. 1982], 121-124) argues that the reference in Plutarch *Crassus* 13.4-5 cannot be to that work. Plutarch writes: *ὁμοῦ δὲ ὁ Κικέρων ἐν τινὶ λόγῳ φανερόν τιν Κράσσου καὶ Καίσαρι τὴν αἰτίαν προσ-
τριβόμενος. ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν ὁ λόγος ἐξεδόθη μετὰ τὴν αἰροῦν τελευτήν, ἐν δὲ τῷ
Περὶ ὑπατείας ὁ Κικέρων νύκτωρ φησὶ τὸν Κράσσον ἀφικέσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.*

Plutarch is here concerned with Crassus' role in the Catilinarian Conspiracy. The sequel of his narrative does not concern us here.

Ms Rawson comments on this passage: 'It has been customary since Schwartz ... to identify this too with our work. But the fact is that *λόγος* must be translated as 'speech'. The word recurs frequently in Plutarch, for example, obviously enough, in the life of Cicero, where it always means either an actual speech, spoken or published, or the like ... The *expositio* would surely have come under the head of τὰ βιβλία ... καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα full of self praise (ch.24), if not of συντάξεις (*Comp.Dem. et Cic.*1); Octavian's memoirs are ὑπομνήματα (ibid. 3). Dio ... calls the *de consiliis suis* a βιβλίον.'

This argument is very forced. It would, indeed, be equally forced to draw precisely the opposite conclusion from Plutarch's language and infer from the μὲν ... δέ contrast that, since the first work is a *λόγος*, the second must be too, and, since the *Περὶ ὑπατείας* was not a speech, that *λόγος* must here have a broad application ('work', 'treatise') covering different types of literature: μὲν ... δέ contrasts do not require complete symmetry between the two elements. Both arguments, in fact, press Plutarch's language too hard. A basic point should be that, while *λόγος* with reference to the works of an orator will of course normally mean 'speech', this cannot be regarded as a certain translation in every case when the orator in question produced other works besides speeches, as Plutarch knew Cicero to have done.

The term *λόγος* is often given precise definition by context (the contrasts *λόγος/ἔργον*, *λόγος/μῦθος*, *λόγος/ποίησις*; also *λόγος* in discussions of oratory or of philosophy), but it has a very wide range of meaning, and by itself and in isolation (as in Plutarch *Crassus* 13) it can be a very vague word, even when applied to categories of literature. *λόγος* is a perfectly acceptable way of referring to practically any literary 'work' (poetry excluded). So, for example, Aristotle in *Poetics* 1454b18 refers to fuller discussion of a topic ἐν τοῖς ἐκ-
δεδομένοις λόγοις: the work(s) here alluded to may in fact have been written in dialogue form (see Lucas ad loc.), but all ἐν τοῖς ἐκδεδομένοις λόγοις means in context is 'my published works'. Similarly, in *Dion* 2.7 our author Plutarch proposes further treatment of 'demonological' problems in ἄλλος λόγος, 'another work'. And, following the example of Herodotus, *λόγος* or *λόγοι* can readily be applied to historiographical works. So Arrian describes his *Indica* as a *λόγος* (*Ind.* 43.14) and his *Anabasis* as *λόγοι* (*Anab.* 1.12.5). Plutarch himself refers to a pair of Parallel Lives as a *λόγος* (*Dion* 2.7 [by implication]; *Thes.* 1.4 *λόγον ἐκδόντες*) besides the terms *βιβλίον* (*Alex.* 1.1, *Dem.* 3.1, *Per.* 2.5, etc.) and *γραφή* (*Dion* 1.1).

The notion that Plutarch should have carefully restricted the application of so elastic

a word as λόγος to a single sense in all his references to Cicero is bizarre. Consequently, the argument 'the word ... always means either an actual speech ... or the like', has no formal validity, even if we concede, as perhaps we should not¹, that this is a true statement of Plutarch's usage in the *Cicero* itself. Similarly, the argument 'the *expositio* would surely have come under the head of' βιβλία, συγγράμματα, or whatever, lacks force: these are relatively precise terms, each of which could be glossed in general terms by the word λόγος (just as in English 'work' can cover such different literary categories as novels, short stories, essays, articles, etc. etc.).

If, then, Plutarch has in mind Cicero's *de consiliis suis* in *Crassus* 13.4-5, he could certainly have referred to it as a λόγος, using the term either quite vaguely or (possibly) with a mild historiographical flavour. That he does have the *de consiliis suis* in mind is, indeed, not absolutely certain, but it is extremely likely, as the material presented by Ms Rawson herself shows. Like the *expositio*, the λόγος openly accused Caesar and Crassus of complicity in the Catilinarian Conspiracy, it was also, like the *expositio*, a βιβλίον ἀπόρρητον, and it was, or was to be, published only μετὰ τελευτήν. These are telling correspondences. The only slight discrepancy is that in Plutarch the λόγος was published μετὰ τὴν ἀμφοῖν τελευτήν, which presumably (although perhaps not certainly) means 'after the deaths of Crassus and Caesar', whereas in Dio 39.10.2-3 the *expositio* was to be published after Cicero's own death. But this small difficulty could be explained by any of several easy hypotheses; inaccuracy of detail on the part of Plutarch or of Dio (whose dating of the *expositio* to 57 is anyway faulty: Rawson 124), or the possibility that sometime after Caesar's death the work was indeed circulated privately among a few of Cicero's friends but not as yet formally 'published' (cf. *Att.* 14.17.6: fuller discussion by K. Büchner in *RE* 7A[1939], 1268, who thinks it was published in the period of the *Philippics*; Rawson 124 is agnostic as to whether it 'was ever polished to its author's satisfaction'; one might as well believe Plutarch).

In any case, Schwartz's identification of the λόγος of *Crassus* 13 with the *de consiliis* remains convincing. This conclusion is important not only for 'Quellenforschung in Plutarch's *Lives*: it also supports other indications (Rawson 123) that the *de consiliis*, whether rightly or wrongly, but apparently sincerely (Rawson 123), was sharply critical of the machinations of Crassus and Caesar in 63.

1. Ms Rawson presumably means 'λόγος with reference to a literary work': otherwise the statement is absurd. But in *Cicero* 2.3 λόγος is more than just 'eloquence' and in 16.5 λόγοι are 'words', not 'speeches'. Plutarchean usage elsewhere (see text) shows that λόγος in Plutarch, even of a literary work, does not necessarily denote 'speech', which of course is in line with normal Greek practice.

Copyright (C) 1982 John Moles

Review: JOHN MOLES (Bangor)

LCM 7.9 (Nov. 1982), 138-139

M.L. Clarke, *The Noblest Roman: Marcus Brutus and his Reputation*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1981. Pp. 157, £10.00

In principle the attempt to write a biography of Brutus must be justifiable. As an individual Brutus certainly made a distinctive mark upon history, and, although the evidence for some periods of his career is sketchy, that for the crucial period - from Pharsalus to Philippi - is good. In practice, however, with the notable exception of M. Gelzer's weighty contribution in *RE* 10 (1917), 973-1020, modern studies of Brutus have been disappointing. In part this is no doubt a reflexion of the scholarship of some of the individuals concerned, but there is, I suspect, another, and fundamental, reason. Quite simply: there is no Brutus problem. The following statements may safely be made about Brutus: he was politically inept; he had some administrative ability (his governorship of Cisalpine Gaul was a success, and in 43-42 he and Cassius won over the East with impressive despatch); in warfare he was a poor strategist and tactician, and a weak disciplinarian.

The question that has naturally tended to dominate discussion is the moral one: was Brutus really a man of strong principles, and, if so, did he sincerely try to apply them to political life? Above all, were his motives in joining the conspiracy against Caesar, his friend and benefactor, essentially disinterested? But in the last resort there can only be one answer to these questions. Any attempt at a seriously critical picture of Brutus, like that of Tyrrell and Purser (R.Y. Tyrrell & L.C. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero* VI [2nd edition, Dublin 1933], cix-cxxiv), falls foul of the ancient evidence, which is all but unanimous in its highly favourable assessment of Brutus' moral character. One can, of course, castigate Brutus for the unscrupulousness of his financial transactions, and there are other blemishes, but the general picture given by the ancient tradition must be accepted. For the ancient tradition cannot be dismissed as merely *post mortem* adulation of a convenient martyr figure. Brutus had a tremendous reputation for 'virtue' in his lifetime, and men as different as Cicero, Antony, Cassius, D. Brutus, Asinius Pollio, and Messala Corvinus were all impressed by what they regarded as Brutus' moral integrity. It is, to say the least, implausible to

suppose that this reputation had no basis in fact, or that so many intelligent men, several of whom knew Brutus well, were duped by a mere show of virtue. Thus, while Brutus remains an interesting figure, he seems, in the final analysis, easy enough to understand.

The conscientious scholar of Brutus therefore faces a difficulty: what is there new to say? One useful approach would simply be to aim for greater factual accuracy than has yet been achieved. There are numerous small problems in Brutus' career, and particularly problems of chronology. In many such instances little progress has been made since Gelzer and since T. Rice Holmes, *The Architect of the Roman Empire I* (Oxford 1928). Often the evidence does not allow definite conclusions to be reached, but in other cases it has not been assessed as precisely as it could have been. Some advances have been made by H. Bengtson, 'Zur Geschichte des Brutus', *SBAW* 1970, 3-50, and E. M. Kniely, *Quellenkritische Studien zur Tätigkeit des M. Brutus im Osten (44-42 v. Chr.)* (diss. Graz 1973), but much remains to be done. Such researches are unexciting, but they are the essential groundwork for more detailed appraisal of Brutus' policies, personality and achievement.

M. L. Clarke has adopted a different solution: the documentation of Brutus' *Nachleben*. His book falls into three main sections: 'Brutus in History', 'The Reputation of a Tyrannicide', and 'Brutus in Literature'. The treatment of the second and third topics is concise, but at the same time (as far as I can judge) erudite and full. Students of the Late Republic will, however, naturally be most interested by the biography of Brutus, the first in English since M. Radin, *Marcus Brutus* (Oxford 1939).

Clarke's Brutus is basically the Brutus of Gelzer and Syme (in *RR*) - indeed of Plutarch: 'we may count Brutus among the best of the Roman nobility' (p. 10) - 'like Cato he took his philosophy seriously and made it his guide to life' (p. 14) - 'he was not the sort of man to think himself anything but in the right' (p. 19) - 'respected though he was, he lacked popular gifts, and was ... rather slow to move' (p. 40) - even 'whatever Brutus' faults and inadequacies he had a moral elevation that no other Roman leader at the time had' (p. 78; cf. Plutarch, *Brutus* 29.3-7). On the other hand Clarke does not gloss over the less pleasant aspects of Brutus' personality (e.g. pp. 18f. & 57f., though more could have been made of Brutus' apparent deterioration during the Philippi campaign), or conceal his political ineptitude (e.g. pp. 39f.). The picture is in general rather idealized (though no more so than Syme's), but on the whole, true as it is to the ancient tradition, it carries conviction.

As an historian Clarke has both strength and weaknesses. He writes extremely well and with considerable narrative flair. His account of the aftermath of the Ides, the slide into civil war, and the Philippi campaign brings out excellently the basic reasons for the Liberators' political eclipse and for their final military defeat. Several of the treatments of critical problems are crisp and to the point, e.g. the rejection of Münzer's idea that the Servilius Caepio to whom Julia was previously betrothed was none other than Brutus (p. 15: Syme has also now abandoned this, cf. *Historia* 29[1980], 422 & n. 4); the dismissal of the 'psycho-history' of Max Radin (p. 30); the refutation of the tradition recorded in Dio that the dying Brutus quoted a tragic couplet in reproach of Virtue (p. 71, though here Clarke is hardly right to suggest that Florus does not 'confirm' Dio: both are presumably Livian).

On the other hand, some of the history has a rather old-fashioned air: 'by declaring Clodius a bad citizen justly killed he was aligning himself with Cicero and the senatorial party against Caesar and the popular party' (p. 17) - 'Lepidus was not a man of much weight' (p. 39) - 'if, as Juvenal says, Thræsea used to celebrate the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius, this certainly looks like a political gesture' (p. 81). Some relevant recent scholarship seems to have been ignored: no apparent use has been made of Weinstock's *Divus Julius*; the discussion of Brutus' date of birth (pp. 11 & 137 n. 4) cites only A. E. Douglas, *Cicero: Brutus* (Oxford 1966), 229f., not the sharper discussions of E. Badian, *JRS* 57(1967), 229, and G. V. Sumner, *Phoenix* 25(1971), 365f.; on p. 141 n. 4 Clarke uses a dating argument for *ad Brut. 1.16* advanced by Tyrrell and Purser but refuted by D. Stockton, *Cicero: a Political Biography* (Oxford 1971), 326 n. 69.

Some important items in the ancient sources have also been missed: the account of Brutus' decision to join Pompey at Pharsalus (p. 20) follows the strongly apologetic Plutarch, *Brutus* 4.1-4; Lucan 2.234ff. is cited on the other side, but not *de viribus illustribus* 82.5, which is decisive on the question: that 'Apollo was the watchword which Brutus gave at Philippi' (p. 66) is the version of Plutarch, *Brutus* 24.7, but it is generally thought, and rightly, that Valerius Maximus 1.5.7 is correct, Plutarch's version being readily explained as a typical 'transference' for literary effect (cf. now C. B. R. Pelling, *JHS* 100[1980], 129). Elsewhere, greater awareness of the literary techniques of some of the sources might have led to a different appreciation of the historical value of particular items: it is misguided to try to use Plutarch, *Brutus* 22.4-6, to date *ad Brut. 1.16* (p. 141 n. 23); Clarke accepts the historicity of the *dictum* attributed to Brutus before the second battle of Philippi in Appian, 4.124.560 (p. 60), but it is surely a literary 'reworking' of the Pharsalus campaign, of a general type to be found several times in Appian and Plutarch.

It is a pity also that Clarke does not deal adequately with two major problems of authenticity. He assumes that of *ad Brut. 1.16* & 17: reference might at least have been made to Tyrrell and Purser VI (cxvff.) for arguments in favour of it: D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem et M. Brutum* (Cambridge 1980), 10-14, now argues against it, but I do not think that his arguments are compelling. Clarke follows L. Torraca, *Marco Giunio*

Bruto: Epistole Greche (Naples 1959) in accepting the authenticity of some of the bizarre Greek letters attributed to Brutus, but the arguments against the authenticity of the whole collection put forward by R.E. Smith, *CQ* 30(1936), 194ff., are much more convincing. Elsewhere, one notices a lack of critical rigour: it is, for example, disconcerting to find (p.64): 'before they crossed over from Asia Brutus had a vision'. Some of the discussions of specific problems - the interpretation of Cicero *Brutus* 331-2 (pp.24f.), the possible identification of Brutus' 'letter' of Cicero *Brutus* 11-12 and 330 with his *de virtute* (p.138 n.1), Cassius' motives in instigating the conspiracy (p.34), the circumstances of Porcia's death (pp.58f.), and the significance of Brutus' use of Apollo on his coins (p.66) are unincisive. There are a few slips: Staius Murcus is rendered as Statius Murcus (p.60), Caecilius Bassus is mistakenly labelled a Caesarian instead of a Pompeian (p.60), in June 44 Antony got Gallia Comata, not Transalpine Gaul, along with Cisalpine Gaul (p.48).

These shortcomings should not, however, be allowed to obscure the merits of this book. In general it is a considerable improvement upon Radin and it gives a fuller portrait of Brutus than Bengtson. While not a book for the specialist, it is a pleasure to read, it provides a useful coverage of Brutus' *Nachleben*, and it should be helpful to undergraduates, particularly Classical Studies students. For the specialist Gelzer's study remains by far the best, although it needs to be supplemented by the researches of W. Stewens, *Marcus Brutus als Politiker* (diss. Zurich 1963), Bengtson, and Kniely, and a few items in the periodical literature.

Copyright (C) 1982 John Moles.

WALDEMAR HECKEL (The Calgary Institute for the Humanities): *Philip II and the quadriga*
LCM 7.9 (Nov. 1982), 139-140

Is it permitted to introduce a piece of evidence, which may have some bearing on the question, without suggesting any concrete answers? Perhaps it has been deliberately overlooked, because it provides no practical solution to the problem. In that case, I offer it merely as an academic curiosity. 'Philip's tomb' has been a favourite subject in recent years: whose tomb is it? what is inside it? and what is on it? Which brings me to the point - at last.

In his discussion of the tomb, N.G.L. Hammond writes: 'In the tumulus on top of the built-tomb there was a brick surround enclosing the cremated trappings of four horses which had evidently been killed in honour of the king and burnt nearby. We are reminded of the famous horses thrice victorious in the chariot-race which were sacrificed at the burial of their owner, the Athenian Cimon 'the Booby' (Hdt. 6.103.3). Since Philip prided himself on his victorious chariot-race, the sacrifice of a team near his tumulus was appropriate.' ('Philip's Tomb' in *Historical Context*, *GRBS* 19[1978], 337). Hammond adds (337 n.21) that these may also be the trappings 'of the horses awaiting the assassin' (cf. Justin 9.5.7, Diodorus 16.94.3-4). A good argument, in either case, for Philip II as the occupant of the tomb.

Recent W.L. Adams has made a good case for Philip III (Arrhidaios). He argues: 'Taking the *quadriga* first, the main argument all along has been that this was a 'Homeric' burial. If that was part of the Macedonian royal burial rites, as both Hammond and Andronikos assert, then it is hardly out of place for any Argead king' (*The Ancient World* 3[1980], 71; cf. P.W. Lehmann, 'The So-called Tomb of Philip II: A Different Interpretation', *AJA* 84[1980], 530 n.44). Furthermore, Kassandros did hold funeral games when he buried Philip Arrhidaios, Eurydike and Kynna (Diodorus 19.52.5; Diyllos, *FGRH* 73 Fl).

In this context belongs an extract from Valerius Maximus which has, as far as I know, never been brought into the discussion:

eodem oraculo (i.e. the oracle of Delphi) *Macedonum rex Philippus admonitus ut a quadrigae violentia salutem suam custodiret, toto regno disiungi iussit eumque locum, qui in Boeotia Quadriga vocatur, semper vitavit. nec tamen denuntiatus periculi genus effugit: nam Pausanias in capulo gladii, quo eum occidit, quadrigam habuit caelatam.* (Valerius Maximus 1.6 ext.9).

Now the beginning sounds rather suspicious and conjures up images of spinning-wheels put to the torch. 'The story of the prophesied fate which is not escaped by any precautions is a favourite motive in folk-tales' (Parke & Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* 1.239). And prophesies of death are generally 'discovered' after the fact. But this is precisely why the passage quoted above may have some value. Philip's *quadriga* was indeed victorious at Olympia - but in 336! With justifiable pride, he featured it on his coinage. But what links the *quadriga* with his death?

According to Justin 9.7.13, Olympias, who rejoiced at Philip's death, consecrated Pausanias' sword to the god Apollo: *novissime gladium illum, quo rex percussus est, Apollini sub nomine Myrtales consecravit, hoc enim nomen ante Olympiadis parvulae fuit.* The story summarized by Valerius Maximus is older than Trogus (apparently going back to, at least, Poseidonios ap. Cicero *de fato* 3.5), but it is very likely that Trogus' original account contained both Valerius Maximus' story and what the epitomator, Justin, did preserve (for Trogus in Valerius Maximus see O. Seel ed., *Pompeii Trogi Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1956). Parke and

Wormell (*The Delphic Oracle* 1.239) conclude:

'If there was at Delphi a sword dedicated with a quadriga chased on the handle, and this sword had traditionally slain Philip, it would be typical of the temple guides to invent a story about an oracle fulfilled, whose moral could easily be pointed to the sightseer by showing the handle of the sword with its emblem. The fact that no version in verse of the oracle exists suits with the supposition that the whole story had a popular origin.' (cf. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* 337, Q214).

But perhaps the fact that a real team was dedicated to Philip II at his burial lies at the heart of this curious story about Pausanias. Somehow the dedications of the murderer's sword and the *quadriga* became confused or conflated, and the result was a piece of fiction worthy of the school of Hellenistic historiography. No a terribly satisfactory explanation, I admit, but the passage in Valerius Maximus (also found in Aelian, *VH* 3.45) needs to be considered in the light of the archaeological findings. If a real object gave rise to the fiction related above, then why not the team itself (for which there is physical evidence) rather than the sword (for which there is none)? And if the story has any historical value, it does at least point again to Philip II as occupant of the tomb.

Copyright (C) 1982 Waldemar Heckel

MARILYN B.SKINNER(Northern Illinois): *Supplementary note on the Latin sexual language: Catullus 56.5-6* LCM 7.9(Nov.1982), 140

I In LCM 7.6(Jun.1982), 87, J.N.Adams demonstrates that colloquial Latin, in sexual contexts, frequently associates an anatomical term in the accusative with a form of 'sympathetic' dative, equivalent to a possessive genitive or adjective. The usage is so common that the anatomical term itself may be omitted; the word in the dative then provides the vital clue to meaning, as in Martial 11.29.8 *nil opus est digitis: sic mihi, Phylli, frica*, where *mihi* prompts the reader to supply the missing noun *mentulam*.

This grammatical observation, which I have paraphrased above, seems to solve the vexed problem of syntax at Catullus 56.5-6 *deprendi modo pupulum puellae | trusantem*. As Baehrens observed, a dative *puellae* cannot possibly be governed by *trusantem*; efforts to explain it as 'dative of direction towards' (Ellis) or 'dative of advantage' (Quinn, with *mentulam* understood as direct object of *trusantem*) have not won acceptance; Kroll's notion that it is a genitive dependent upon *pupulum* may enjoy its popularity, despite the vagueness of the expression, precisely because it does least violence to the Latin. Construing *puellae* as a sympathetic dative and supplying *cunnum* as the implicit object of the participle makes for a neater and wittier locution than those afforded by previous attempts at elucidation. And the Martial passage provides an exact parallel.

On this hypothesis, the second ellipse in the poem, signalled by *rigida mea* in line 7, assumes greater importance. With the shocking words *cunnum* and *mentula* left out, the anecdote is ostensibly *dignam auribus et tuo cachinno*, fit for the ears and laughter of the addressee - who must certainly be M.Porcius Cato, famous for his *severitas* in his own time (Valerius Maximus 2.10.8) and for subsequent generations an emblem of tight-lipped prudery (Petronius 132; Martial 1.1.15-21; Juvenal 2.40: for further references, V.Buchheit, *Hermes* 89[1961], 353-355). Of course, the missing nouns will readily pop into the mind of any reader, even a Cato. Moreover, Catullus may expect his audience to recall the radical Stoic contention that there is actually no such thing as obscenity, either in the act or in the word (Cicero, *Fam.* 9.22), a view quite at variance with the moral stance of that professed Stoic. In any case, the urbanity of the poem resides in the elaborate measures taken not to say what hardly needs to be said.

Copyright (C) 1982 Marilyn B.Skinner

F.JONES(St Andrews & Cape Town): *A visual pun at Juvenal 12.81* LCM 7.9(Nov.1982), 140

*sed trunca puppe magister
interiora petit Baianae pervia cumbae
tuti stagna sinus, gaudent ubi vertice raso
garrula securi narrare pericula nautae.*

After Juvenal's *poetica tempestas* we do not want a serious reference to Roman customs relating to storms. The collocation of *garrula*, *securi* and (*gaudent*) *narrare* ('prattling', 'untroubled' and [see Smith at Petronius 44.1] 'chat') countereffects the earlier exaggeration of the storm and this is emphasized by the attribution of *garrula* to *pericula* (on 'transferred epithet' see Williams at *Aeneid* 3.357). We are invited to see the dangers as gossip fodder subject to the competitive exaggerations of sailors' yarns. This lack of seriousness brings out an ambiguity in *vertice raso*. For not only did sailors saved from shipwreck shave their heads, but *moriones*, the *stupidus* in mime (cf. Courtney at Juvenal 5.171) and freedmen (and therefore *scurrae*, of their nature given to *garrulitas*) did so too. In Juvenal 5 it is prophesied of Trebius, who is assimilated to such figures as Sarmentus and Gabba, that he will offer his head *pulsandum vertice raso* (5.171; as 12.81 is the only other occurrence of the phrase in Juvenal it may be making a conscious allusion to 5.171, but this is not necessary for my point). Here then, at 12.81-82, the sailors are playing the clown with Catullus' epic storm. A similar ambiguity is inherent in Petronius 103, where Encolpius and Giton are shaved to look like punished slaves, but a passenger mistakes this for *naufragorum ultimum*